



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME PHASES OF NEGATION IN LATIN

By R. B. STEELE
Vanderbilt University

The ways of negation are an interesting problem in Latin, and this applies, not merely to the negation of individual terms, but of propositions as well. The first of these is a double question of the use of a separate negative or of a compound word, the negative part of which, once an independent term, by the impact of pronunciation became an integral part of the word. This took place in the spoken language at some time before the beginning of literature, yet in the latter are evidences of selection and of the survival of the fittest.

When Latin became embodied in literature it had two distinct, simple, separable negatives, *haud* and *ne*. These, considered on the basis of frequency of occurrence, were of entirely unequal value, both as distinct terms and in the frequency of combination with other terms. The use of *haud* is freest in Plautus and Terence. There is an occasional instance in the fragments of Ennius as well as in Lucretius, who has *haud igitur* several times at the beginning of lines, the negative being one of several monosyllables preceding *igitur*. Caesar has but one occurrence (*B.G.* v. 54. 5): *Idque adeo haud mirandumne sit*. Cicero has *haud scio* an eleven or twelve times in his orations, twenty-five times in his philosophical works, and a few times in his letters. With *dubito* the occurrences are not nearly so numerous. It is noticeable in Livy, perhaps as a result of the early sources from which he drew. It is very rarely used by Quintilian, is not in the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, though occurring at least 174 times in the historical works of Tacitus.

A few illustrations from Plautus will show its equivalence to *ne* or *non* in independent clauses except with the imperative. *hau verbum quidem* (*Poen.* 1355); Lysiteles *nisi tu nevis*; Char-mides *immo hau nolo* (*Trin.* 1156); *quo evadas nescio* (*Poen.* 173); *qui sperem hau scio* (*ibid.* 1208); Milphidippa *tum pol ego id quod*

celo hau celo; Palaestrio immo et celas et non celas (*Miles Gl.* 1014); *at pol ego hau credo, sed certo scio* (*Cas.* 355); *cerae quidem hau parsit neque stilo* (*Bach.* 996). However, *haud* is strongly contrasted with *ne* in the maintenance of its independence, for in compounds it is found only with *dum* and *quaquam*. *Hauddum* is found in Livy and in his poetical imitator Silius Italicus, while there are only a few scattering examples of *haudquaquam*.

The usage with *ne* was much freer. As an uncombined negative it is found in commands either with the imperative or the subjunctive, as also with the latter mood in wishes. Statements similar to *ne nega* are common in Plautus, and occasionally one like *ne dixis*. Its intensive force is especially noticeable in *ne . . . quidem*, as in *ne ille quidem*, "not he even," as against all others. This force it continued to have especially in the formula *non modo, sed ne . . . quidem*, in which the *ne* was felt as a negation of the entire statement when only one verb was used. An illustration of this is: *Quae non modo amico, sed ne libero quidem digna est* (*Cic. De Amicitia* xxiv. 89). It seems to have been a much more sociable particle than *haud*, for it has a considerable range in compounds with words of all classes. Some illustrations are, for nouns: *Nemo (ne-homo)*, *nihil (ne-hilum)*, *ne-fas*, and with the form *neg-*, *neg-otium*; for pronouns, *ne-uter*; for adjectives, *nequam (ne-aequus)*; for adverbs *ne-quaquam*, *ne-quiquam*; for particles, *ne-cubi*, *ne-cunde*, *ne-dum*, *ne-que*; for verbs *nego(ne-ago)*, *ne-queo*, *ne-scio*. But the most interesting of all the combinations is that with the term which was next to nothing—*unum*. There was no Promethean nor Washingtonian voice to warn *ne* of an entangling alliance with *unum*, from the wedding or the welding with which came the victorious particle *non*. With the growth of this strengthened negative the sphere of *ne* became almost entirely limited to that of subordination. For a similar contest between particles, we may compare the results as set forth by Professor Gildersleeve, "*The Encroachments of μή on οὐ in Later Greek*" (*American Journal of Philology*, I, 45 ff.).

Ne had been an independent particle with the imperative; it passed over with the verb to the subjunctive in indirect commands. Notice the comment of Servius on *Ne saevi, magna*

sacerdos: Ante dictum est: nam nunc ne saevias dicimus, nec imperativum iungimus adverbio imperantis (ad Verg. Aeneid, vi. 544). The change to the subjunctive, with the same verb and with *non* for *ne* is illustrated by Plautus (*Capt.* 139) where Ergasilus asks *egone illum non fleam? egon non defleam | talem adulescentem?* in reply to the command of Hegio *ne fle*; the subordination of the verb, which occurs a few times in Plautus, by *Casina* 322: *orat, opsecrat | ne Casinam uxorem ducam.* *Ne* was used with negative wishes, and so passed over to the expression of the positive fear, as in Ter. *Andria* 349: *id paves, ne ducas tu illam; tu autem, ut ducas.* But here *non* often intruded, and the combination *ne non* was used, as in Plautus (*Casina* 575): *metuo ne non sit surda atque haec audiuerit.*

I. NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS

The use of negative compounds is one of the most interesting questions in Latin. *Haud* was practically, if not altogether, excluded; the range of *non*, while somewhat more extended, was very limited, as in *nondum*, *nonne*, *nonnullus*, and *nonnumquam*. Yet the field of negative formations is of considerable extent, as there were used with negative force a number of prefixes both separable and inseparable.

A. SEPARABLE PREFIXES

Particles meaning "away," "from," "apart," usually indicating separation, may also have a negative force. These are all illustrated by a number of words indicating the lack or the loss of sense, *amens*, *amentia*, *demens*, *dementia*, *discors*, *discordia*, *excors*. Illustrations are also found of the same force in similar or different words.

Ab.—*Absimilis*, "not like," and *absonus*, "not proper sound," are adjectives whose meaning is changed to the opposite through the force of the preposition.

De.—The compounds in *de-* reach the same goal as those in *ab-*, though by a different route. The latter is "away from" till the extremes meet, while *de-* is "down and out." Some of the compounds with the latter are especially interesting, as *dehortor*, *dedecet*, *dedisco*, *dedoceo*, and *dedoleo*.

The contrast between the positive and the negative forms of *hortari* is seen in Plautus (*Poen.* 674): *neque nos hortari neque dehortari decet*. For the negation of the negative, see *Capt.* 210: *si erit occasio, haec dehortor*. A good example of *dedecet* is Horace *Odes* i. 38. 7 ff.:

neque te ministrum
Dedecet myrtus neque me sub arta
Vite bibentem.
The myrtle unbcomes neither you the servant, nor
me drinking under the matted vine.

Dedecus and its kindred forms are not infrequent, and were early formations, as is shown by Plautus *Bacch.* 498: *qui dedecorat te*; and *Trin.* 297: *mores . . . quibus boni dedecorant se*. While these are early, other formations are late, as *dedecratio*, *dedecorator*, *dedecorus*.

The contrast between learning and unlearning goes back at least as far as Plautus, who has in *Amph.* 687: *haud aequom facit qui quod didicit dediscit*. This is similar to Cicero (*Pro Quintio* xvii. 54): *multa oportet discat atque dediscat*. Compare Quint. i. 1. 5: *Non assuescat ergo, ne dum infans quidem est, sermoni qui dediscendus*. But along with unlearning must go unteaching also, as is shown by Cicero (*Tusc. Disp.* ii. 25. 60): *Cum a Zenone fortis esse didicisset, a dolore dedocitus est*, "When he had learned from Zeno to be brave, he was untaught by pain." As illustrating the two phases of teaching may be given Cicero (*De Oratore* ii. 17. 72): *ut docendus is est aut dedocendus*; and, especially with reference to pupils who have been poorly taught, Quint. ii. 3. 2: *Cum geminatum onus succedentes premat et quidem dedocendi gravius quam docendi*, "Since a double burden weighs hard on those following, and indeed they must be untaught more vigorously than be taught." See also the declaration of Horace (*Odes* ii. 2. 19): *Virtus populumque falsis | dedocet uti | vocibus. Dedoleo*, "to grieve no more," occurs in Ovid (*Rem. Amor.* 294), and also in *Fasti* iii. 480, where Ariadne says *potuisse dedoluisse semel*, "I could have grieved it out once for all."

Dis.—The compounds in *dis-* usually retain the meaning "apart," indicating merely a change in position, as in *discolor*,

"to change color," but not "to uncolor," which is a different matter. But in the adjectives *discors*, *dissimilis*, and *dispar*, and the formation *discrepabilis*, "not to be reconciled," there is a negation of the basic meaning. This is also true of *difido* and also of *dissuo*, "to unsew," which is used in contrast with *discindo* by Cicero (*De Amicitia* 21. 76): *Tales amicitiae sunt . . . dissuendae magis quam discindendae*, "Such friendships ought to be unsewed rather than ripped apart." He mixes his figures in *De Officiis* i. 33. 120, where, also speaking of friendships, he declared *decere censem sapientes sensim diluere quam repente praecidere*, "Wise men think it fitting to wash away gradually than to fore-cut suddenly."

Ex.—Compounds in *ex-*, as *excors*, "heartless," *exlex*, "lawless," *expers*, "partless," and *exsors*, "lotless," are illustrations of the negation of the base of the word. *Excornis bestia* (Tert. Pall. 5) is a "dehorned beast." One of the most interesting occurrences of any of these words is Ter. *Heauton Timorumenos* 652: *si moreretur, ne expers partis esset de nostris bonis*. In this, *expers partis* indicates that the derivation of *expers* was not known to the speaker, as also in the combination *nemo homo*.

Se-, sine.—The prefix *se-* or *sed-* usually has the meaning "apart" in compounds, as *se-cerno*, *se-grego*, *se-paro*, and *sed-itio*. But in the adjective *se-curus* and kindred forms the meaning of the compound is the opposite of that of the base, indicating, not a state of safety, but a state of mind separated from care, so "care-free," or as a noun "freedom from care." The prepositional form *sine* is used with the ablative of a noun where the corresponding negative adjective or quasi-participle had not been developed. As illustrations we may take *sine pondere*, "without weight" or "weightless," and *sine vulnere*, "without wound" or "woundless." It seems that the Romans did not develop the adjective *imponderabilis*, or *imponderatus*, while the first occurrences of *invulnerabilis* are in Seneca, and *invulneratus* is found only in Cicero *Sest.* 67. 140: *invulnerati inviolatique*. For different stages of development compare *sine culpa* with the Vulgate, Heb. 9:14: *qui . . . semetipsum obtulit deo inculpatum*, "who offered himself without fault to God." In considering the occurrences in poetry we must

bear in mind the metrical value of the complex. This is especially true in the hexameter, in which the ablative with *sine* can often be translated by an English adjective in *-less*. We find in Vergil *Aeneid* iii. 204, *sine sidere noctes*; Ovid *Metamorph.* i. 26, *sine pondere caeli* (iii. 417, *sine corpore amat*); v. 549; vii. 830; xi. 429, *sine corpore*; viii. 275; viii. 518, *sine nomine*. These gave the ending of a dactyl and a complete dactyl, one of the most serviceable units that could be constructed. With dissyllables *sine* was but little less serviceable, as in Vergil *Aeneid* v. 694: *sine more furit*; vi. 534, *sine sole domos*; Ovid *Metamorph.* ii. 537: *sine labe columbas*; vii. 306, *sine fine pacisci*. The full equivalence of the ablative with *sine* and other negative formations is shown by such passages as Plautus *Trin.* 375 and 378, where Philo uses *sine dote uxorem* and follows this with *Egone indotatam te uxorem ut patiar?* See also *Curc.* 469: *vel vitiosum vel sine vitio, vel probum vel improbum*; and *Capt.* 695: *pol si istuc faxis, hau sine poena feceris*, contrasted with *Aul.* 751: *si ebrio atque amanti impune facere quod libeat licet*.

Absque.—Because of its separative force *absque* with noun or pronoun and a subjunctive has the force of the protasis of a contrary to fact condition, as in Plautus *Persa* 836: *nam hercle absque me foret et meo praesidio, hic faceret te prostibilem*; Ter. *Phorm.* 188: *nam absque eo esset recte ego mihi vidisse*. In classical and late Latin are a few occurrences of *absque*, as the equivalent of *sine*, e.g., Gell. ii. 2. 7, *absque praeiudicio*, “unprejudiced.”

B. INSEPARABLE PREFIXES

The prefix *ve-* is of very little importance as compared with *in-*. Still there are a few formations that are interesting. Most so is the word *Ve-Jovis*, “Ve-Jove” or “Anti-Jove,” the Etruscan divinity of the lower world, in function antithetic to Jove. We find *vecors* and *recordia*, both similar to other compounds of *cors*. In addition to this *vegrandis* occurs a few times as a negative of *grandis*, and also a few times as augmentative. However, this particle is an almost negligible element compared with *in-*, which is by far the most important of all those occurring with negative force. If *immo* is the superlative of *in*, this particle must once have been independent, and the form so freely used by Plautus

means "most assuredly no," with the "most," however, to be associated with the "no." The need of negative formations was felt by Cicero, and he made use of Greek negative verbals (see *American Journal of Philology*, XXI, 405 ff.). This fact becomes the more interesting when we consider the remark of Munro (*Lucretius*, Vol. II, Introduction, p. 11): "Had Cicero chosen to apply the prolific energy of his intellect to the task, he might have invented and wedded to beautiful language as copious a terminology as was afterwards devised by the united efforts of Tertullian and the other fathers, Aquinas and the other schoolmen." But this Cicero did not choose to do, and the free development of negative formations was left to later writers. It remained for Livy and Ovid, and especially the Christian Fathers, to develop this side of the language to an extent not dreamed of by Cicero.

At the head of the list are the negative participial formations, of which about 350 are given in Harper's *Dictionary*. The positive forms of the words had been long in use, but it was necessary for the early churchmen to develop the negative phases of many in order to set forth fully their ideas concerning the kingdom which was not of this world. Many an act in earlier times had been expiated, but Augustine found it necessary to speak of an *inxpiatum dedecus*, just as St. Hilary did of the *inxquisita iudicia dei*. Tertullian mentions *innumerata miracula* and *substantia informis et inspeciata*. *Inrefutatus* is used by Lactantius, and other forms by other writers. There are also a few examples of the formation of negative verbs. The occurrences of *di infelicitent* in Plautus illustrate the earlier development of a negative form, for *felicito* seems to be late. The range of *infitor* and *infitas ire* is wider, although the latter form of denial is not in Caesar nor Cicero. By the side of *dehonoro*, which is a late formation, may be found *inhonoro*, which occurs in Tertullian. Harper's *Dictionary*, s.v., says, "Hence *inhonoratus*," but this statement should be reversed, as the negative verbal was used long before the negative verb. The same is true of *inviolatus:inviolo*. The formations on the base *inoboedi-, -o, -ens, -enter, -entia*, as well as the adjective *inoboedus*, are all late. Next in order come the allied forms in *-bilis, -biliter, and -bilitas*, of which there are in round numbers 225, 60, and 25.

It is interesting to note that some of the words are explained by other negative formations. The *Dictionary* defines *ininterpretabilis* by "inexplicable," *ininvestigabilis* by "unsearchable," and *inopinabilis* by "unconceivable." It takes some other form of the basic word to give the meaning of *inenatabilis*, "from which one cannot swim out"; *innominabilis*, "that cannot be named"; *inobscurabilis*, "that cannot be obscured"; *insenescibilis*, "not growing old." The effect of Christian needs is seen in *incoquinatus*, -*biliter*, "undefined" and "undefilably," *incommutabilis*, -*iter*, -*itas*, "incommutable," "incommutably," and "incommutability." Similar to these are *incontaminabilis*, *incontemplabilis*, *incorruptibilis* and its kindred forms, *indeterminabilis*, and *indemutabilis*. Tertullian has *immarcescibilis flos*, "the flower which fadeth not away," *ineffigiaabilis anima*, "the spirit which cannot be portrayed," and Rufinus *incompellabilis*, "the one which cannot be addressed by name." The remainder of the list of negatives is made up mostly of adjectives, there being only a few on noun bases, as *inanimis* and *inermis*.

While the completest development of the negatives was in late Latin, the use of negative formations was firmly fixed by the time of Plautus, this being especially noticeable when there is a contrast with a positive term, as in *Amph.* 437: *iniurato . . . iurato*; *Casina* 827: *ex parata imparatam*; *Miles Gl.* 208: *incoctum . . . coctum*; *ibid.*, 227: *facta infecta*. Notice also *Most.* 197 (Philematium): *non spero*: (*Scapna*) *insperata accidentum magi' saepe quae quam spes*. As illustrations of the massing of negatives, see *Persa* 408: *inpure, inhoneste, iniure, inlex, labes popli*; and *Bacch.* 613: *petulans, protervo, iracundo animo, indomito, incogitato, sine modo et modestia sum, sine bono iure atque honore, incredibilis inposque animi, inamabilis, inlepidus vivo, malevolente ingenio natus*.

II. NEGATIVES

While the negatives were in process of integration, disintegration was also going on. *Ullus* became *nullus* and then *nonnullus*, just as *umquam* became *numquam* and then *nonnumquam*. But a more common phase is the use of an independent negative with

negative terms. *Ne nega* is fairly common in Plautus, as well as combinations, such as *haud immerito tuo* (*Menaechmi* 371), *haud imperiti* (*Miles Gl.* 919), *haud iniquom* (*Rud.* 1096), *haud ineuscheme* (*Trin.* 625). With these may also be placed the negation of immoral terms, as *hau meretricie* (*Miles Gl.* 872) and *non meretricium* (*Most.* 190).

As has been stated the negative of the wish *ne* was sometimes used with *non* to express the positive fear, and in the same way *nec non* became an affirmative expression, as in Vergil *Aeneid* vi. 183: *Nec non Aeneas*. Beginning with *Georg.* i. 212, Vergil took up the use of *nec non et*, and continued it in the *Aeneid*, generally placing the combination at the beginning of a verse. It seems to have been a taking innovation, and is noticeable in some later writers. Both Pliny the Elder and Quintilian have *nec non . . . quoque*, while Apuleius goes beyond the rest with *nec non et equum quoque illum meum reducentes* (*Metamorph.* xi. 20), "and bringing back too that horse of mine also." Both *nec non* and *nec non et* were metrical conveniences, and were used by prose writers because of the poetical coloring.

The denial of the negative does not necessarily affirm the positive, though it often practically does so. *Haud dubito* is taken as the equivalent of *certum est*, and *haud iniuria*, "not unjustly," as "justly." Because of this the negative is often used with some indefinite term, leaving the statement still indefinite. This usage started early, as we find in Plautus *haud absurdum*, *hau bonus*, *hau longe*, and others of a similar nature. There is with these no clear affirmation of the approximation to the positive equivalent. A number of words, *gnarus:ignarus*, *memor:immemor*, and *merito:immerito*, furnish a fine field for the study of the use of the negative in constructing descriptions "far, vague, and dim." Of these words Caesar has only *memor* twice. Cicero in his orations and philosophical works has *ignarus* either with or without a negative. Both *memor* and *immemor* as well as the one occurrence of *merito* are without a negative. In contrast with these writers Tacitus has *gnarus* forty-four times and *ignarus* fifteen times with a negative and sixty-eight times without. The figures for *memor* and *immemor* are eleven and three; for *merito* five. Notice in

Ann. xi. 27. 2: *haud sum ignarus . . . gnara*; and in contrast with *nescius* (vi. 38. 13; xv. 54. 13). The usage of Quintilian should be of interest to us, as he was a teacher of the old school, and believed in both Latin and Greek. *Nonnumquam*, *nonnulli*, and *nec immerito* prevail throughout his work, and taken as a whole he uses expressions such as *non utiliter* with considerable freedom.

Non sine is the negative expression used most freely, especially in the phrase *non sine causa*. This obviated the necessity for the negative *incausatus*, just as the negative expressions *sine dubio*, *procul dubio*, and *haud dubium* kept off the negative *indubitatus*, which did not appear till the time of Quintilian, and kindred forms are still later. Caesar has four examples, Tacitus none at all, while of the seventy-five in the orations and philosophical works of Cicero, thirty-five, or just a little less than one-half, are with the negative.

III. NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

The effect of a negative on relative temporal statements is worthy of notice. In actions known or assumed to have taken place, we may use either "not before" or "not until"; instead of "not while," either "before" or "after"; and "before" or "while" for "not after." There are, however, other constructions in which a negative, *ne*, *quin*, or *quominus*, is not an incidental but a necessary part of the statement. The first of these has already been mentioned. *Quin* was originally used in independent statements, as in Plautus *Bacch.* 276: *quin tu audi*; *ibid.* 861: *quin tu me exsolui iubes?* In course of time the verb was changed to the subjunctive, when the statement was made dependent on a negative expression, as in *Trin.* 495: *mirum quin tu illo tecum dinitias feras*, for the paratactic *quin . . . fers*; *mirum est*, "why don't you carry your riches with you: 'tis strange." This construction remained true to type, with many variations in the main clause, even to the use of affirmative declarations. With verbs of hindering *quominus* was more freely used, though Caesar does not use it with *impedio* nor *prohibeo*, and Cicero only occasionally. Draeger ii. 690 quotes Terence (*Andria* 196): *Si sensero*

hodie quidquam in his te nuptiis Fallacie conari quo fiant minus, as proof of the original purpose force of the construction. But the thwarting of the purpose of the slave would be a good joke in the eyes of the master, and it would be only the attained result that would be worthy of punishment. Viewed in this way, the statement does not differ from the mass of examples in which, after verbs of hindering, it is the result which is held in view, as in Cicero *Ad Att.* viii. 8. 2: *intercludor dolore quo minus ad te plura scribam*, which, translated to show the paratactic relation, would be, “Wherefore do I not write more to you? I am shut off by pain.”

There is a group of negative expressions as *non est*, *nihil est*, *non habeo*, and *nihil habeo* which are associated with *quod*. Cicero in his epistles again and again repeats the words *nihil habeo quod scribam*, and has in *De Sen.* v. 13: *nihil habeo quod accusem senectutem*. This does not mean that there was lacking what he ought to write or accuse, but that there was nothing “writable,” or “accusable.” Had the form been developed he might have used *nihil scriptabile* (see *Dictionary*, s.v., *scriptilis* and once *accusabilis* in Cicero), but not having it he used a relative clause instead. Seneca uses *non est quod* freely with the subjunctive as a polite substitute for a negative imperative, e.g., *Dial.* iii. 20. 6, *nec est quod existimes verum esse*.

We can imagine the time when to the Latin, not yet a Roman, the only form of negation was a shake of the head. This he later expressed in general propositions by *abnuo*, and in some numerals, as *duodeviginti*, by *de* and the finger accompaniment. After the language became embodied in literature, ways of negation showed uncounted variations involving questions of syntax as well as of form, and in addition inexplicable personal selections. *Nil moror* was well known to Plautus, as well as the genitive *nihil* with such words as *homo*, *facere*, and *pendere*. Hexameter verse requires forms of *nil*, but classic prose *nihil*. Quintilian striving to bring back literary style to the Ciceronian norm must have frequently used *nec immerito* to his pupils, though Cicero seems not to have used it at all, and this is but one illustration of the personal element involved in the discussion.